4

C.F 400=00

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH
AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION No. 1554/2001

PETITIONER : Labho Satnami, S/o Chandra Ram Satnami, Aged about 35 years, R/o Sohagpur, P.S. Sarsiwa, Tahsil Bilaigarh, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)

P.R. No. 16697
Presented by Shri M. V. Pandey
dated 22.8.01

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. The State of Chhattisgarh Through - The Secretary of Panchayat and Sirmah Vikas, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Collector, Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
3. S.D.O., (prescribed authority) Bilaigarh, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
4. Tahsildar, Bilaigarh, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)

अपर आयुक्त, बिलासपुर संभाग बिलासपुर तहसील 2318

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P. 1554/2001 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	19.9.2001 : Mr.Manoj Paranjpe for the petitioner. Mr.Deep Kesharwani for the respondent/state. Perused the relevant rules and regulations applicabl to the present case. It appears that the best course open to the writ petitioner is to approach the competent authority i.e. the Collector highlighting his grievance. According to the counsel for the petitioner the petitioner could not approach the collector as the time allowed under section 21 Sub rule 4 states that the time allowed for such purpose is seven days whereas he took 10 days in obtaining the certified copy. It appears that the petitioner could have approached the Collector even without certified copy if there was any difficulty in obtaining the same. Since there is a prescribed competent authority, I am of the view that such prescribed authority must be given its power to exercise. Accordingly this petition is disposed of. Let this petitioner ~~should~~ approach the Collector within 7 days from today. ~~Reference~~ On receipt of such reference the Collector shall examine and dispose the same on merits by a speaking order within ~~the~~ further period of one month. Shri Paranjpe submits that since the petitioner has not	

...2

पीछे देखिये

आदेश पत्रक (पुर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित ..2..	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
J	handed over the charge to any one, he should be allowed to continue until the matter is finally decided by the Collector. In my view I can only say this much that the interim prayer in this regard should also be considered by the Collector himself. However, I am further of the opinion that it would be fair to say that if no charge has been taken over from the writ petitioner till date, he may be allowed to continue until this interim matter is considered by the Collector himself. Sd/- Chief Justice	